

1 HILARY POTASHNER (Bar No. 167060)
Acting Federal Public Defender
2 Seema Ahmad (Bar No. 270992)
(E-Mail: Seema_Ahmad@fd.org)
3 Ashfaq G. Chowdhury (Bar No. 243763)
(E-Mail: Ron_Chowdhury@fd.org)
4 Deputy Federal Public Defender
321 East 2nd Street
5 Los Angeles, California 90012-4202
Telephone: (213) 894-2854
6 Facsimile: (213) 894-0081

7 Attorneys for Defendant
TEOFIL BRANK

8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
11 **WESTERN DIVISION**

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 TEOFIL BRANK,

16 Defendant.

Case No. CR 15-00131-JFW

**DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO
GOVERNMENT'S
SUPPLEMENTAL PROPOSED
JURY INSTRUCTIONS (DOCKET
NO. 262)**

Hearing Date: July 9, 2015

Hearing Time: 7:45 a.m.

Courtroom of the Hon. John F. Walter

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Mr. Brank objects to the Government's Supplemental Proposed Jury Instructions (Docket No. 262), and specifically, the Government's Supplemental Proposed Instruction Relating to Count Six: Use of an Interstate Facility to Facilitate an Unlawful Activity California Law on Extortion (Count Six Supplemental Instruction). Docket No. 262 at 2-3.

First, this is the first time, the evening before trial, that the government has ever offered an instruction as to California law. The government did not submit any instruction as to California law in either of its two previous sets of proposed jury instructions.

Second, it is plain from a reading of the lengthy Count Six Supplemental Instruction that the instruction will confuse the jurors. The instruction is lengthy and confusing, with numerous terms that will raise definitional questions and issues. Further, the proposed instruction will itself require additional clarifying instructions that the elements of California extortion are separate and distinct from the elements of federal extortion set out in Counts 1, 2, and 5. The late-filed supplemental instruction raises the strong possibility that the jury may find Mr. Brank guilty of California extortion and therefore incorrectly conclude that he is also automatically guilty of the federal extortion counts in Counts 1, 2, and 5.

//

//

//

//

//

//

1 Most significantly, the California instruction contains no guidance on the claim
2 of right defense that has been judicially read into extortion statutes by federal case law.
3 See Ninth Circuit Model Criminal Jury Instruction No. 8.142A.

4
5 Respectfully submitted,

6 HILARY POTASHNER
7 Federal Public Defender

8 DATED: July 8, 2015

By /s/ Ashfaq G. Chowdhury

9 ASHFAQ G. CHOWDHURY

10 SEEMA AHMAD
11 Deputy Federal Public Defenders
Attorneys for Defendant, TEOFIL BRANK
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28